

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments add claims 36-39 dependent from claims 1, 8, 9 and 10, respectfully, that further limit the transmission processing selection to "at the target device." These claims are believed to be clearly allowable.

For the reasons stated in the Remarks on pages 13-16 of the Amendment filed on September 7, 2006, Applicants again urge that the selecting can occur immediately at a target device (e.g. sub CPU 601(e) of device 30 in Fig. 3) or at a local PC 11 or 13 (Fig. 4) associated with the device 30. The specification at page 40, last three lines, to page 41, top 2 lines, is in point. As claims 1, 4-10, and 33-35 are therefore believed to define patentable differences over the prior art of record.

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the application are respectfully solicited.

Dated: November 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 439-4444

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant